District of Texas) I was absent for rollcall votes 288 to 309. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted as follows: 288, no; 289, no; 290, no; 291, no; 292, yes; 293, yes; 294, yes; 295, yes; 296, no; 297, yes; 298, yes; 299, yes; 300, yes; 301, yes; 302, yes; 303, yes; 304, yes; 305, yes; 306, no; 307, no; 308, yes; 309, no; 310, no; and 311, no.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK BILL

SPEECH OF

HON. JAY DICKEY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 59, the National Right to Work Act.

No American should be forced to join or pay dues to a labor union just to get or keep a job.

H.R. 59 would free millions of Americans from coercion in the workplace by simply removing the forced union dues provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and Railway Labor Act.

Mr. Speaker, a vote on the National Right to Work Act is long overdue. I urge you to schedule a vote without delay.

PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1998

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill is yet another attack in the ongoing attempt by conservative Members of this House to deny reproductive choice to women.

When faced with a difficult choice, teenage girls should be encouraged to seek the advice and counsel from their elders and not be concerned with criminal consequences.

If passed in its current form, this bill would criminalize the conduct of a grandmother who helps her granddaughter in a time of need. This bill will not lead to better family communication where it does not already exist. This bill is invasive and intrusive and denies a young woman the right to face a difficult choice with safety and dignity.

Furthermore, H.R. 3682 raises important federalism issues. Laws from one State do not follow people to another.

Mr. Speaker, more than 75 percent of young women already involve one or both parents in their decision. When a young woman cannot involve a parent, she should be encouraged to involve a trusted adult without the fear that the adult who accompanies her could face incarceration. One study found that half of all young women who did not involve a parent did involve an adult, including 15 percent who involved a step parent or adult relative. If this bill passes, these individuals could be jailed for helping to obtain a legal medical procedure.

H.R. 3682, if enacted, would put a young woman's life at risk should she be unable to involve a parent or guardian. It will increase the chance that she will seek an illegal or self-induced abortion or delay the procedure, making it more dangerous.

Instead of increasing the risks involved in abortion, let us support measures to make abortion less necessary by reducing teen pregnancy, promoting adolescent reproductive health education, and expanding access to confidential health services (including family planning).

Let us not turn our backs on young people and criminalize the assistance of a parent or trusted adult. Young women must not be isolated from a supportive parent or trusted adult and must be encouraged to make open, honest and safe choices.

We must protect young women from coercion by strangers, but not from the support of a caring adult. Mr. Speaker, this bill will put the reproductive health of young people at risk and infringe upon an individual's constitutional right to privacy and reproductive choice.

This bill is in need of clarification to differentiate between the act of a caring adult and the act of an individual deserving criminal persecution.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

ADDRESSING THE Y2K CHALLENGE

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, by now we are well aware of the Y2K problem that poses a threat to virtually every aspect of our daily existence. My good friend and colleague, Mr. HORN, has done an outstanding job of raising awareness within Congress and every federal agency on the need to address this complex challenge. Indeed, every American is potentially affected by the Y2K problem and educating the public is critical to avoiding major disruptions in our daily lives.

Raising awareness is the key to proposing solutions. To that end, I would like to share with you and submit for the record a very fine article that recently appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. The piece, ''Crash 2000,'' was written by Bruce Chapman, president of the Seattle-based Discovery Institute. The Discovery Institute has recently launched a two-year project on the many diverse public-policy issues connected with Y2K.

The Discovery Institute will host a conference on Y2K and related public policy concerns in Washington, DC on September 24. This conference will focus upon specific issues that need to be considered by Congress, the Executive Branch and other levels of government to minimize the effects of the Y2K transition. Well-known technology author George Gilder will moderate the day-long session which will also feature Congressman HORN and some of the best and brightest minds on the Y2K issue.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, June 14, 1998]

FOCUS CRASH 2000

LIFE WITH COMPUTERS AT RISK SHOULD Y2K DISEASE PROVE DEADLY

(By Bruce Chapman)

From airport traffic control to tax refunds, from ''just-in-time'' package deliveries to time-sensitive hospital equipment; from fire and police services to defense commands, products and activities we take for granted could slow or stop.

That's the Year 2000 problem scenario, a disquieting possibility that is nagging increasing numbers of public and private leaders.

In a year and a half, as the new millennium opens, the lives of everyone not residing in some Stone Age redoubt will be affected to an unknown extent by a bizarre glitch in many of the world's computers and software products. Even the minimum likely outcome is worrisome.

Take the disruptions of last year's United Parcel Service strike, when hundreds of businesses failed, combine them with the recent service stoppage on 40 million pagers when the Galaxy 4 satellite broke down, and replicate such effects in other sectors of the U.S. economy and around the world—simultaneously.

Other outcomes could be worse. Nobody knows how bad it could be. They do know that ''it'' will happen on Jan. 1, 2000. A program to stimulate greater public awareness, understanding and action is needed. Yet a communications gap between the culture of the technology industry and that of the political world is slowing the response to the 2000 problem, or ''Y2K,'' as it is coming to be known.

The individualistic people in the technology industry do not naturally make connections between their world and the realm of everyday public life. They tend to fear the government when they do not scorn it. People in the public sector often have difficulty comprehending the economic and social impacts of technology. To them, tech is just another industry to be taxed, regulated and litigated. But at the start of the new century, a programming foible of years gone by—compounded by repetition—threatens to make obvious the big, unavoidable connections between technology and public policy.

The problem arose from widespread use of a coding technique to save digital space in computers—shortening the designation of years by eliminating the number denoting the century. The date ''1998'' is merely rendered ''98'', for example. Even if some people thought of the troubles that might occur when the year 2000 rolled around, in the fast-changing world of high technology, systems were not expected to last long enough to matter.

The unanticipated result as the year 1999 changes into 2000 is that many computers will read ''00'' to mean ''1900.'' They will have no way to control the resulting calculations appropriately. Whole systems, including personal computers and mainframes, and software products of various kinds, could malfunction, spit out errors erratically, or simply crash. With them would crash the billions of orders and transactions and industrial processes upon which our lives have come to depend.

At potential risk are: critical infrastructure (water, power, telecommunications, transportation); government services at all levels; banking and finance, here and overseas. The very uncertainty about the prospects for these functions could trigger an anticipatory economic contraction well before 2000.

Huge private and public repair efforts already are under way. Some national banks' Y2K bills are running up to $600 million. A Securities and Exchange Commission study released last week estimated that the top Fortune 250 corporations alone expect to spend some $37 billion on the problem.

Many companies' systems are fixed already. But that won't necessarily protect them from failures experienced by their suppliers, or their customers. Nor will it protect

them if their computers interact with systems that are not fixed. Analyst Mark R. Anderson, who spots technology trends from his highly wired aerie in the San Juan Islands, sees ''networks'' as ''the greatest Y2K problem. If my computers are fixed, and yours are not, I'm not sure I want to be linked to yours that (Dec. 31, 1999) midnight.''

To put the matter in personal terms: Your bank assures you that it is entirely and certifiably compliant. But if that bank starts getting bogus data from malfunctioning computers at other banks—say, from overseas—or finds that it cannot get information at all from federal financial institutions, its own systems could be compromised.

Edward Yardeni, economist with Deutsche Morgan Grenfell in New York, citing the tardiness of private and public entities in confronting the Y2K problem, estimates the chance of a major recession as 60 percent. ''The likely recession could be at least as bad as the one during 1973–74, which was caused mostly by a disruption in the supply of oil. Information, stored and manipulated by computers, is as vital as oil for running modern economies.''

A Federal Reserve study a few months ago estimated a repair cost to private business in the United States of about $50 billion and to the economy of only a fractional percent of growth, but those estimates already are probably out of date. A private study by Y2K specialists at the Gartner Group in Palo Alto, Calif., sees a $115 billion dollar domestic tab and a $600 billion cost worldwide.

It is instructive that the head of one vitally affected federal agency, the IRS, does not even dispute the extent of potential danger. Commissioner Charles Rossotti told a Congressional committee this spring, if repairs cannot be made in time (and IRS is far behind, ''There could be 90 million taxpayers who won't get their refunds, and 95 percent of the revenue stream of the U.S. could be jeopardized.''

''Could be.'' Nobody knows for sure. A lot can happen in a year and a half.

''It's still unclear how much pain there will be,'' says Microsoft's Bill Gates.

One reason for uncertainty is that many information systems are not, as it were, technologically transparent. Instructions may be embedded in locations where one does not expect them. Old systems may have idiosyncratic, even whimsical, programs written by someone long gone and in an obsolete program language.

The rickety IRS system, for example, dates from the 1960s. Given the workload in bringing critical systems to a point of Y2K compliance, Gates is among those who propose that ''From today forward, 'triage' is the order of the day.'' In the battlefield, a surgeon applying the triage policy divides casualties by categories of those who are in good enough shape to ignore, those past saving and those who can be saved with prompt action. Triage for information services means deciding which systems are of relatively low priority and can be repaired later, those that are past saving and must be replaced or abandoned, and those needing immediate fixes.

That Gates has anything at all to say in Y2K these days is commendable. Many businessmen are afraid to mention the subject. Business Insurance, a trade journal, reports that ''Security is tight for many corporate conversion projects because of the concern that their stock prices might fall when the word got out about how much it will cost to bring their systems into compliance.'' Even the Securities and Exchange Commission is having a hard time getting information from companies, according to testimony before a Senate hearing last week. But before long, as public awareness grows, enterprises that cannot boast of major efforts to become Y2K compliant could become the ones risking stock owner displeasure. Nothing hurts a stock price like a breakdown in basic corporate functions.

Business leaders also are being warned by their lawyers to keep quiet because of the threat of lawsuits. The Journal of the American Bar Association estimates that there will be a trillion dollars worth of claims as a result of Y2K. Trial lawyers already are holding conferences to examine opportunities for suits against tech companies and others if their systems fail. But again, with time it may become clear that those companies will fare best that are most active in preventing Y2K trouble and trying to help others—including the public.

Actually, the government itself may have contributed to today's punitive legal atmosphere by its aggressive actions on other matters, from monopoly suits against Microsoft and Intel, to efforts to stop telecommunications and cable mergers. The federal government, by keeping such a low profile on Y2K for so long, also has slowed public education on the overall Y2K threat. The government did know about it. Almost two years ago, after receiving a special report from the Congressional Research Service, Sen. Patrick Moynihan, D–N.Y., sent an urgent letter to President Clinton, alerting him to the Year 2000 problem, and warning that it ''could have extreme negative economic consequences during your second term.'' He later publicly termed Y2K a potential ''national emergency.''

Yet it was only four months ago that the White House appointed John Koskinen, a former Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to head a new President's Council on Year 2000 Conversion. Koskinen is an experienced crisis manager, but his job is still less that of a policy ''czar'' than that of a facilitator. He has a small office and three employees.

Of course, by now few large corporations need education from the federal government on the serious of Y2K. But the same cannot be said of small businesses. Surveys show that many of these remain blissfully indifferent. The National Federation of Independent Business and Wells Fargo Bank have discovered that only one in six small businesses has even looked into the subject. Richard Bergeon, president of Systemic Solutions, Inc., in Seattle and co-author (with Toronto consultant Peter deJager) of ''Managing 00: Surviving the Year 2000 Computing Crisis,'' predicts that, given present trends, ''as many as 50 percent of small businesses may fail.''

Meanwhile, White House special adviser Koskinen has tried to lower expectations of what his office can do to help the economy as a whole. ''We have to figure out how we can help people organize themselves. There's no way for me or the federal government to manage this problem.'' Regarding the government's own functions Koskinen has promised a full report on preparations by early 1999.

But Congress is not about to wait that long. After holding several discouraging hearings this winter and spring, Rep. Steven Horn, R-Calif., a former university president who heads the House Government Reform and Oversight subcommittee on technology, last week graded the federal efforts an ''F.'' He demanded that ''The president and his administration must set priorities if the conversion is to be successful . . . Now is the time for the president to designate the Year 2000 problem as a national priority.''

It seems likely that pressure will continue to grow on the president, and on Vice President Al Gore, a technology enthusiast, to expand federal readiness efforts. Publisher and possible Republican presidential contender Steve Forbes has been particularly outspoken, terming the situation a ''leadership crisis, rather than a technology crisis.''

Horn and Forbes have gained credibility from reports issuing lately from the government's independent General Accounting Office and the inspectors general in various departments. The reports cite deficiencies in most departments, indicating that at the present rate of change, a number of major federal functions are unlikely to be Y2K compliant on time.

For example:

Some failures of mission-critical defense systems are ''almost certain,'' reported the GAO, unless the pace of fixes is greatly increased. The Department of Defense has spent $2.9 billion, but lacks key management and oversight controls, the GAO says. If the Defense Message System fails, ''it would be difficult to monitor enemy operations or to conduct military engagements . . . Aircraft and other military equipment would be grounded.''

The Labor Department already has spent $160 million of the $200 million allocated to it to help states convert computers that handle unemployment insurance. Labor's inspector general told a congressional committee he fears for the department's ''benefit payment systems for job corps students and injured coal miners, longshore and harbor workers and federal employees and their families.'' Only 13 of 61 systems in the Labor Department have been identified as Y2K compliant.

The Education Department is so tardy that it still has no comprehensive Year 2000 plan.

Despite recent improvements, it is uncertain that the Department of Health and Human Services will be able to process some $200 million in Medicare payments or the $170 billion awarded annually in research grants for cancer and other diseases. The problems of HHS, like the IRS, are compounded by computer problems beyond the Y2K threat.

Experts told the Horn Committee that the Federal Aviation Administration is so far behind in Y2K readiness that it may have to ground planes in 2000. However, White House adviser Koskinen is more optimistic, believing that the FAA will have completed its repairs by the end of the year and will have another year for testing.

The Social Security Administration, with 92 percent of its project completed, is in better shape than any other federal agency. The Horn Committee graded it an A+. But, as Internet columnist Victor Porlier notes, the agency has been working on the problem for seven years, yet even it is not finished. What does that say about the prospects of agencies that have barely begun?

Also, how will a fully functional agency such as Social Security persevere in sending out checks and meeting its own payroll in 2000 if a dysfunctional IRS and Treasury Department cannot collect and distribute federal money?

Finally, says Porlier, Social Security's experience, wherein systems had to be tested early and repeatedly, underscores the importance of adequate time for testing and debugging before systems can be certified as truly 2000 compliant.

That time is fast disappearing.

SECURITIES LITIGATION UNIFORM STANDARDS ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1998

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to vigorously support the Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1998. This bill is the culmination of a long, hard effort to enact securities reform.

During the last Congress, we struggled with and finally crafted a law that ensures that those who have genuinely been defrauded have access to courts and to justice, while preventing the misuse of our justice system.

This landmark legislation, the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, ultimately passed with widespread bipartisan support. I strongly supported this legislation.

We passed this bill in response to the increasingly troubling practice of ''strike suits,'' in which a small group of attorneys frequently took advantage of the legal system to backmail high tech companies for huge settlements, with little or no evidence of wrong doing.

These frivolous strike suits particularly damaged the companies in Silicon Valley. According to one study, 53% of Silicon Valley's top 100 technology companies have been subject to securities fraud claims.

Despite our best efforts last Congress, opponents have sought to sidestep the new federal securities laws. To avoid the new heightened federal standards, a number of securities fraud suits have moved from the Federal to the State courts.

According to a study by Stanford Professors Joseph Grundfest and Michael Perino, 26% of securities litigation activity has shifted to state courts.

Because of this development, executives now advise me they are reluctant to rely on the 1995 Act's safe harbor provisions when making public statements about their companies' prospects. This hurts investors who lose access to valuable information, and it undermines the efficiency of the market.

It is time to close the loopholes. The Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998 will finally slam the door on strike suits by establishing Federal court as the exclusive venue for securities class actions.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. I would also like to commend my colleagues Anna Eshoo and Rick White for their hard work in pushing this issue forward.

I pledge to work with my colleagues to move this bill speedily through Conference and into law.

TRIBUTE TO MR. WILLIAM K. TAKAKOSHI

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant as he retires from his position as Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of the Army after more than 28 years of dedicated service to his country. Mr. William K. Takakoshi is most deserving of our tribute. He has consistently demonstrated the outstanding qualities expected of our finest public servants. I would like to take a moment to highlight Bill's career milestones.

A native of Rockford, Illinois, Bill is a 1970 graduate of the University of Illinois with a B.S. in Industrial Engineering. Upon graduation he was commissioned as a 2nd Lieutenant in the Army Reserve. In 1971, Bill earned a Masters Degree in Industrial Engineering and Business Administration from Purdue University.

Bill entered public service in 1970 as an Industrial Engineer at the Naval Ammunition Depot at Crane, Indiana. He was responsible for the production and industrial engineering for the five main Naval Ammunition Depots.

In 1975, he was assigned as the Resource Branch Head of the Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific. In that capacity he was responsible for planning, acquisition, and management of all the resources required to activate the missile facilities of the first TRIDENT Base.

In 1981, after a tour at the Joint Cruise Missiles Program Office where he was the Deputy Production Manager, he accepted a position with the Army. For the next seven years he served as Deputy for Industrial Resources and Quality and Production for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development, and Acquisition). During that time his primary focus was oversight of the Army Ammunition and Industrial Preparedness programs.

Because of his vast experience and knowledge of the acquisition process, he was selected by the House Armed Services Committee as a Legislative Fellow. Bill served on the Acquisition Policy Panel for the Procurement Subcommittee for a complete legislative cycle.

Upon his return to the Department of the Army in 1989 he was made Director, Program Review for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development, and Acquisition) and was selected for the Senior Executive Service.

In 1990, because of his vast experience he was handpicked by the Under Secretary of the Army to serve as his Special Assistant. Since that time Bill has been the focal point within the Army for finding positive solutions and resolving difficult issues that cross varied interests and organizations. Bill Takakoshi is truly a ''team player''. He is always on top of the issues of the day and has the respect and confidence of the OSD and congressional staffs. He is the paramount professional, quiet and unassuming but one who always gets the job accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present the credentials of Mr. Takakoshi to the Congress today. It is clear that the Department of Defense is losing a great talent. I would like to wish both Bill and his wife Gay continued success in all their future endeavors.

NUANGOLA CHAPEL HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the Nuangola Chapel in Northeastern Pennsylvania. The Chapel will mark its centennial with a service and luncheon on Sunday, July 26. I am proud to have been asked to participate in this event. Late in the nineteenth century, the newly-organized Triangle Lake Association built an uncovered platform in a grove of trees for the purpose of dances and other social activities. On Sundays, the platform was used for services and Sunday School.

In 1890, Nuangola consisted of only about twenty-four cottages, all on the west side of the lake, but it had grown considerably by 1898 when John Reader proposed building a chapel. A meeting was held at the dance platform and a committee was formed to consider the idea.

In the minutes of that meeting the lake was referred to as ''Triangular Lake.'' However, there were three other bodies of water in the country with that name at that time. To avert confusion, the U.S. Postal Service used what was thought to be the original name of the lake—Nuangola—after an Indian maiden thought to have drowned there. The new committee decided to call itself ''the Nuangola Chapel Association.''

On September 10, 1898, the committee petitioned the court to grant it a charter. The petition was granted and recorded for the purpose of maintaining ''a chapel for public worship of Almighty God, evangelistic but nonsectarian.'' The chapel was built and dedicated in 1904 and it has been used every Sunday during the summertime since 1900.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate the fine congregation of the Nuangola Chapel on its Centennial Celebration. I send my very best wishes on this milestone event for continued prosperity in the years to come. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to bring the Nuangola Chapel's proud history to the attention of my colleagues.

THANK YOU, EVIE FOSTER

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1998

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, we all have concerns about how to best deal with crime, and are likely to agree that the best solution is one in which the impetus for criminal action has been removed. At no time is this more important than when we are dealing with young offenders. Those skilled individuals who help juveniles turn away from the path of crime are special people, and deserve to be celebrated.

The people of Bay County, my home county, have had the good fortune to have had Evie Foster as the Community Services Coordinator for youthful offenders for the past eight years. She is retiring from the Office of the Bay County Prosecutor after a term of great accomplishment. In that time, she has placed over 1,000 young people in various work sites around the County, helping them learn the value of productive effort. Judge Paul Doner hired Evie to work in the Probate Court as the Coordinator in 1990, and we all thank him for that excellent decision.

It is no surprise to anyone who has had the privilege of knowing Evie Foster that she has been so successful. She started working at